

SENATOR DE CAMP: Mr. President, this is the amendment we were dealing with yesterday. We didn't get to take it up for a vote. I suggested to you it is kind of a significant and major amendment. It deals with the Sunshine Law and would allow those who feel they want to be accountable in the old way, in other words, accountable directly to their people, to do it that way and I would urge adoption of the amendment. I think since it is Senator Warner's bill and Senator Warner has worked in this area, I would hope he could comment as to his attitude on it.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion? Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would like to just briefly indicate some support for the amendment as I read it now. First, I think one of the important aspects of it is the first portion which limits the reporting requirements of people serving on County or Municipal Planning Commissions, which as I recall is consistent with the way the bill was originally introduced two years ago in that they are required only to report those real estate holdings within the jurisdiction in which their zoning powers exist. I think that is a reasonable approach and necessary one. Then in addition to the amendment that was adopted the other day, of course, so does the elected officials have to report in total as any other elected official but those who serve on Planning Commissions are limited only to the report on where they have financial interest. The other portion of the amendment which is somewhat new and I suppose people could argue the point that by allowing an individual to voluntarily not to make a report is somehow or other reducing the effectiveness of the Sunshine Act. I don't concur in that because the way the amendment is proposed, it will appear on the ballot if you are an elected official that you decline to provide a disclosure statement. Certainly that is informing the public and I rather suspect that the last thing one would want to do is attempt to use that. On the other hand, since with the Act is all inclusive now with County and Municipal officials and we have been told many times in smaller communities that provision is not necessary, that the people in the area would not be interested, would not have a concern that those running for Village Board would be required to do all these things. This provides the kind of flexibility for those circumstances which obviously would exist some places around the state where that could be used and avoid some of the problems that have been predicted from this. On the other effect of the bill, those who serve in appointed offices and are required, they, too, could sign an affidavit but the public again would be informed, at least on an annual basis, that individuals were serving in appointed positions who declined to give their disclosure statement. It seems to me that this may be a more workable solution than trying to figure out on some size basis or a variety of options as to who ought to be included and who should not. One thing I want to emphasize, I totally disagree with anyone who would suggest, at least on my part, that support of this amendment is meant to reduce the effectiveness of the Sunshine concept. I have introduced legislation as long as fourteen years ago which had the effect of more open reporting, more required reporting on candidates running for public office and I don't object to that concept at all. I do personally feel that there is some logic and right in the concept of right of privacy and